

## Chapter–V

### Love as Human Need (भक्ति पुरुषार्थ)

Philosophical analysis always keeps a room for opponent's view, self- analysis, self-corrections and hence further progress. So, as we find another very important view regarding the ultimate *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ) or highest goal of life, it cannot remain (left) undiscussed. In this chapter we will concentrate on *bhakti* as *puruṣārtha* (भक्ति पुरुषार्थ) and the arguments which *bhaktivādin-s* generally give in favour of their doctrine. Discussion of *bhakti puruṣārtha* (भक्ति पुरुषार्थ) involves reference to *Vaiṣṇavism* in general and *Gouḍiya Vaiṣṇavism* in particular. The doctrine of *bhakti* (भक्ति) of the *Gouḍiya Vaiṣṇava-s* not only admits that *bhakti* (भक्ति) is *parama puruṣārtha* (परम पुरुषार्थ) but also says that *bhakti* (भक्ति) is a *puruṣārtha-sādhana* (पुरुषार्थ-साधन) or the means to achieve it. The modern Hindu-s, in general, do not support *bhaktivādin-s* view that *bhakti* (भक्ति) is a *parama puruṣārtha* (परम पुरुषार्थ) or highest goal of life. But they support mainly *bhaktivādin's* two points. One is that *bhakti* (भक्ति) is a way or *sādhana* (साधन) to achieve God and the other is that *karma* (कर्म) does not help to achieve *parama puruṣārtha* (परम पुरुषार्थ).<sup>1</sup>

To start the discussion of *bhakti* (भक्ति) we want to discuss first why we have not included the discussion of *bhakti* (भक्ति) in FVP and PTP or in the chapter of individual *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ). In general we can say that it was not included in PTP, for the doctrine of *bhakti* (भक्ति) is not admitted by any philosophical systems of India. And it was not included in FVP, for modern people of India or modern India has not added *bhakti* (भक्ति) in the popular or familiar

list of *puruṣārtha-s* (पुरुषार्थ). But it is not enough for explaining the reason why we have not included the discussion of *bhakti* (भक्ति) in either PTP or FVP. We would discuss this matter first. After that we would discuss how *Bhaktivādin-s* (भक्तिवादी) say that *bhakti* (भक्ति) is both a *parama puruṣārtha* (परम पुरुषार्थ) and means to attain it. We would also concentrate on three sources of *Bhaktivāda* — the *Gītā*, the *Bhāgavatpurāṇam*, and *Tantra*. We would discuss also the place of *bhakti* (भक्ति) in the famous debate between *Samuccayavāda* (समुच्चयवाद) and *Asamuccayavāda* (असमुच्चयवाद). To strengthen their doctrine sometimes *bhaktivādin-s* say that some world famous Advaita Vedāntins also accept *bhakti* (भक्ति) as *parama puruṣārtha* (परम पुरुषार्थ). We would critically examine whether we can reasonably say that (or not) by citing some passages from original text on this matter. In discussing such points we would discuss many more points which will come in the scope of the said topics.

Many years ago *bhakti* (भक्ति) movement started and gradually it has taken a specific form. Even today it is very popular among a large number of people in India. Sri Chaitanya-deva founded *Gouḍiya Vaiṣṇavism* and the supporters of *Gouḍiya Vaiṣṇavism* plays a leading role to establish the distinction between *bhakti* as a means (साधन-भक्ति) and *bhakti* as an end in itself (साध्य-भक्ति). The people who do not accept *karma* (कर्म) theory admit *bhaktivāda* (भक्तिवाद). To put it otherwise, the person who does not believe in *karmavāda* (कर्मवाद), generally does not believe in *Classical Hindu dharma* (सनातन हिन्दु धर्म) also. And these modern Hindus though generally are not interested to support *bhakti* (भक्ति) as a *parama puruṣārtha* (परम पुरुषार्थ) or ultimate goal of life, yet they strongly

support *bhakti* as a *sādhana* (साधन भक्ति) or means or way and not *karma* (कर्म) (whatever it is<sup>2</sup>). It follows, therefore, that the context of *bhaktivādin-s* and believers in modern Hinduism both admit *bhakti* (भक्ति) as a better way than *karma* (कर्म) to achieve life's highest fulfilment. Even uneducated simple minded people want to reach to their God through the path of *bhakti* (भक्ति).

We have not discussed *bhakti* (भक्ति) in our previous three important chapters — FVP, PTP and Individual *puruṣārtha-s* (पुरुषार्थ). In the chapter of Individual *puruṣārtha-s* (पुरुषार्थ) we have discussed those *puruṣārtha-s* (पुरुषार्थ) which are already mentioned and admitted in FVP. So, since *bhakti* (भक्ति) has not been admitted in the list of *trivarga* (त्रिवर्ग) or *caturvarga* (चतुर्वर्ग) of FVP, it has not been explained in the chapter of individual *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ) also. One may suggest here that we should admit two versions of FVP: one is of four *puruṣārtha-s* (पुरुषार्थ) which we have already discussed and another version will add another *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ) and that is *bhakti* (भक्ति). Then in the second version *bhakti* (भक्ति) will be placed in the fifth position. Many scholars have discussed *bhakti* (भक्ति) as fifth *puruṣārtha* (पञ्चम पुरुषार्थ). But problem will arise when one will try to understand the relation between *bhakti* (भक्ति) and the rest of the four *puruṣārtha-s* (पुरुषार्थ). For this reason and some other reasons *bhakti-vādin-s* do not admit any other *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ) other than *bhakti* (भक्ति).

One may say here that *bhakti* (भक्ति) theory may be a philosophical theory and hence it may be explained as a version of PTP. Before going to discuss whether the theory of *bhakti puruṣārtha* (भक्ति पुरुषार्थ) is a philosophical theory or not let us discuss first what conditions a theory must fulfil to be a

philosophical theory. One of the important marks of a philosophical theory is that it must be a most general theory. Hence, a philosophical theory of *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ) is a most general theory and it admits only one *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ). This *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ) is the highest *puruṣārtha* (परम पुरुषार्थ) or highest goal of life. Different philosophical systems admit highest *puruṣārtha* (परम पुरुषार्थ) (only one) in their own ways. According to Advaita Vedānta, *niratiśaya sukh* (निरतिशय सुख) (pleasure that cannot be excelled) is the highest goal of life. But according to Nyāya philosophy, absolute freedom from suffering (आत्यन्तिक दुःख निवृत्ति) is the *parama puruṣārtha* (परम पुरुषार्थ). Similarly, according to the *bhaktivāda* (भक्तिवाद) or *Bhakti darśana* (भक्तिदर्शन),<sup>3</sup> *bhakti* (साध्य भक्ति) is the highest goal of life. From this standpoint it seems that *bhaktivāda* (भक्तिवाद) may be admitted as a philosophical theory like Nyāya, Vedānta etc. So, one may suggest that *bhaktivāda* (भक्तिवाद) may be included in PTP and it may be admitted as a version of PTP. This answer we have explained with reason why a *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ) admitted in FVP and a *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ) admitted in PTP are not the same. The former is based on the sources like *Purāṇa*, *Itihās* etc, but the later is not derived from such sources. The theory of *bhaktivāda* (भक्तिवाद) whether we take it as the works of Sri Madhusūdana Saraswatī or *Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavism* — their views are mainly derived from *Bhāgavat Purāṇam*.<sup>4</sup> So, the *bhakti* (भक्ति) theory or *Gouḍīya Vaiṣṇavism* is very much different from any philosophical system in Indian philosophical Tradition like Nyāya, Vedānta etc. In any philosophical system we see mainly two types of discussions — discussions of *pramāṇa* (प्रमाण) and discussions of *prameya-s* (प्रमेय). In another sense, philosophy includes the discussion of logic, metaphysics, epistemology, ontology etc. But

the *bhakti* (भक्ति) theory is not a study in that sense. Hence it is not a philosophy or *darśana* (दर्शन). It is often called *bhagavat dharma* (भगवत् धर्म).<sup>5</sup>

Secondly, in a sense the *bhakti* (भक्ति) theory can be said more like a theory of art (काव्य-शास्त्र). For, it offers analogies and not any argument and explanations in a strict philosophical sense. As for example, it tells us about the nature of *bhakti* (भक्ति), conditions of *bhakti* (भक्ति) and its types. But to explain these things it never offers any arguments, rather it tells us that *bhakti* (भक्ति) arises when the mind becomes liquefied (द्रवीभूत). And it is liquefied when it is heated. To answer the natural questions what heats it (तापक) and how mind can be liquefied, the *bhakti* (भक्ति) theory takes help of an analogy. They say a piece of sealing wax or lac (जतु द्रव्य) is a hard substance. When heated by fire it becomes liquid. Mind, like sealing wax, becomes liquid when it is heated by heating factors (तापक) like emotions, anger etc. When a mind is thus liquefied and it takes the impression of God (भगवत् आकार), we call it *bhakti* (भक्ति).<sup>6</sup> Now the question is how the emotions of anger etc. are produced? The answer is *Bhagavat dharma* (भगवत् धर्म). What is to be understood by this *dharma* (धर्म)? It has been said that 'भगवद्धर्मश्च भगवद्गुणश्रवणम्'.<sup>7</sup> This means *Bhagavat dharma* (भगवत् धर्म)<sup>8</sup> consists in listening to the stories etc. about God. Thus in this way *bhaktivādin-s* tells about *bhakti* (भक्ति) and it proves that it is nothing philosophical. So we cannot take the *bhakti* (भक्ति) theory as a second version of PTP. We also discussed earlier why we cannot take it as a second version of FVP. Therefore, we decided to discuss it separately.

There are many more arguments why we should not take *bhakti* (भक्ति) theory as a version of PTP. One such important reason is that there is no such system of Indian philosophical Tradition which have mentioned *bhakti* (भक्ति) theory or any *darśana* (दर्शन) which can be called as '*Bhakti darśana*' (भक्तिदर्शन). Usually different standard systems mention other systems as opponent (पूर्वपक्ष) and refute their views. But no system mentioned *Bhakti darśana* (भक्ति दर्शन) as opponent's view. So, neither as opponent's view nor as proponent's view (सिद्धान्त) we get any reference of *bhakti* (भक्ति) or the theory of *bhakti* (भक्ति).

Thirdly, according to some modern scholars, *bhakti* (भक्ति) theory is not any kind of *darśana* (दर्शन), rather it is included in Tantra (तन्त्र).<sup>9</sup> Tantra (तन्त्र) here stands for the *Āgama* (आगम)<sup>10</sup> Tradition. But all the *āstika darśana-s* (दर्शन) are related (positively or negatively) to the tradition of *Nigama* (निगम) or the Veda (वेद) or the *Śruti* (श्रुति) or *Trayī* (त्रयी).

There is another sense in which the *bhakti* (भक्ति) theory is different from any philosophical system. Sometimes it is called *bhagavat dharma* (भगवत् धर्म). For it discusses mainly *dharma* (धर्म) or *paurāṇika dharma* (पोरानिक धर्म). It is not concerned about any philosophical theory or *darśana* (दर्शन) or any philosophical or practical discussion of life. It only tells us the means and goal of human life and this goal means highest fulfilment or highest value of human life.

So far as *bhakti* (भक्ति) as *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ) is concerned it involves, as we have said before, the reference of *Vaiṣṇavism* in general and *Gauḍīo Vaiṣṇavism* in particular. According to Gauḍīo

Vaiṣṇava-s, *bhakti* (भक्ति) is not only a *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ) but the way or *sādhana* (साधन) to reach this *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ) is also *bhakti* (भक्ति). Like the different systems of Indian philosophical Tradition, *bhaktivāda* (भक्तिवाद) or *bhakti darśana* (भक्ति दर्शन) has not been developed. It is believed that like *Buddhism* and *Jainism*<sup>11</sup>, or some may give other arguments in favour of the matter, *bhaktivāda* (भक्तिवाद) has been developed as a reaction to classical Hindu dharma or *sanātan Hindu dharma* (सनातन हिन्दु धर्म) and its rituals. This reaction is known as a movement and this movement is known as *bhakti* movement or *bhakti āndolone* (भक्ति आन्दोलन)<sup>12</sup> of India. It is a religious reform movement against *sanātan Hindu dharma* (सनातन हिन्दु धर्म) and its rituals. In other words, they were against *karmavāda* (कर्मवाद). *Gauḍīo Vaiṣṇavism*, advocated and founded by Sri Chaitanyadeva, played a leading role of this *bhakti* (भक्ति) movement. As a chief advocator of *Gauḍīo Vaiṣṇavism*, Sri Chaitanyadeva was also against classical Hindu dharma and its rituals. Not only that, he was also against the major forms of *bhaktivāda-s* (भक्तिवाद) of south India. The reason is this: in this major form of *bhaktivāda* (भक्तिवाद), *karma* (कर्म) has not been totally rejected. But in *Gauḍīo Vaiṣṇavism* both *karma* (कर्म) and the rituals related to *karma* (कर्म) are totally rejected. They believe that this *karmavāda* (कर्म वाद) is a very narrow and orthodox conservative theory. They also believe that *dharma* (धर्म) is not a matter of conservative ritualistic performances rather it is a matter of experience and feelings of the heart. Only *bhaktivāda* (भक्तिवाद) teaches us real *dharma* (धर्म) and that is *bhakti* (साध्यभक्ति) through *bhakti* (साधनभक्ति). For, according to them, the path or way to reach God is also *bhakti* (भक्ति). Here *bhakti* [*sādhana bhakti* (साधनभक्ति)] means *Bhagavat-prem* (भगवत्-प्रेम), *Bhagavat-seva* (भगवत् सेवा) or

loving and serving God, *kirtana* (कीर्तन) his names, his *karuṇā* (करुणा) or glories and deeds, listening his stories of different ages (श्रवण) and many more things. In brief, *sādhana bhakti* (साधनभक्ति) means the things related to God but not to *karma* (कर्म). They also say that it is the main message of the *Gītā* as well as the *Bhāgavat Purāṇam*.

But actually this is not the case. In the *Gītā* and the *Bhāgavat Purāṇam* it was never said anywhere that *karma* (कर्म) has no role to play for achieving *mokṣa* (मोक्ष). Rather in the *Gītā* it has been said that *jñāna* (ज्ञान), *karma* (कर्म) and *bhakti* (भक्ति) are admitted for their specific role to achieve *mokṣa* (मोक्ष). In the *Bhāgavat Purāṇam*, *karma* (कर्म) has been regarded as a means of *bhakti* (भक्ति) or *bhakti yoga* (भक्तियोग).<sup>13</sup> So it is admitted in the *bhakti* (भक्ति) theory that *karma* (कर्म) has some role to play in man's quest for life's highest fulfilment. But in Advaita Vedānta we see a contrasting view.

According to some modern scholars, who are also known as modern Hindus, this contrasting view of Advaita Vedānta, in a sense, is more radical. These modern scholars believe that *karma* (कर्म) and rituals are not important and so not to be followed. According to them, *karma* (कर्म) is neither direct means nor indirect means of *mokṣa* (मोक्ष) or *parama puruṣārtha* (परम पुरुषार्थ). They also think that only those who are superstitious follow these rituals. But it is only the *jñāna* (ज्ञान) and not *karma* (कर्म) or anything else which is helpful for achieving liberation. So, *jñāna* (ज्ञान) is the heart of Hinduism<sup>14</sup> and not *karma* (कर्म). They believe and give reasons in support of their views that Vedānta (in the *Upaniṣada* or Vedānta darśana) is the most acceptable form of Hindu *dharma*<sup>15</sup>. According

to some pro-Vedānta modern scholars, not only *bhaktivādins*, Vedāntins also opposed to *karma* (कर्म). These men believe that classical Hinduism wrongly emphasizes on *karma* (कर्म) and so called ritualistic performances and on the other hand the *bhakti* (भक्ति) theory wrongly emphasizes on emotions, moods and sentiments. The *jñānavāda* (ज्ञानवाद) of Vedānta avoids both these two approaches of classical Hinduism and *bhakti* (भक्ति) theory stated above. It avoids the mechanical approach of *karmavādin-s* (classical Hinduism) on the one hand and the emotional or sentimental approach of the *bhaktivādin-s* (भक्तिवादी) on the other. These men (scholars) are known as modern Hindus. Recent time, for these men, Vedānta is a great attraction.<sup>16</sup> For, they think that Vedānta [in the sense of *darśana* (दर्शन)] gives importance to *jñāna* (ज्ञान) and not *karma* (कर्म).

This group believes that Vedānta rejects *karma* (कर्म) as a means of religious or spiritual uplift of man. For, Vedānta does not even grant that *karma* (कर्म) is an indirect means of *mokṣa* (मोक्ष). They cite passages from the *Gītā* in their support and refer in particular to the verses 42 – 44 of the canto two of the *Gītā*. The *Srīmad Bhagavad Gītā* is one of the three great sources (प्रस्थान) of Vedānta *darśana* (दर्शन). According to these scholars, the message of Vedānta is: *karma* (कर्म) has no role in man's greatest fulfilment of life<sup>17</sup>. In other words, *karma* (कर्म) has no place or even any subordinate place in achieving *mokṣa* (मोक्ष). But if it is true about *Vedānta darśana*, then they will be regarded as more radical *asamuccayavādin-s* (असमुच्चयवादि)<sup>18</sup> than Nyāya or *Vaiśeṣika darśana* (दर्शन). For these modern scholars believe that Vedānta *darśana* (दर्शन) hold the view that there is only one means to

achieve liberation and that is *jñāna* (ज्ञान). *Karma* (कर्म) has no role at all to achieve this goal. So, the question does not arise whether it is an equally direct means (समुच्चय-वाद) or it is only an indirect means (असमुच्चय-वाद) of liberation. If we see the classical works on Advaita Vedānta or even the work (भाष्य) of Ādi Śaṅkarācārya, we do not get this radical view. So, this radical view about *karma* (कर्म) is a modern view and it is their own interpretation or understanding about Vedānta *darśana* (दर्शन). Their view about the *Gītā* needs to be thoroughly examined. Even when we study the commentary on the *Gītā* of Ādi Śaṅkarācārya, we see that he has discussed both *samuccayavāda* (समुच्चयवाद) and *asamuccayavāda* (असमुच्चयवादवाद) but he has not discussed radical *asamuccayavāda* (असमुच्चयवादवाद) where *karma* (कर्म) will have no role for achieving liberation. Anyway here we just want to show that there is a long debate between *samuccayavāda* (समुच्चयवाद) and *asamuccayavāda* (असमुच्चयवाद) regarding the means of liberation, but *bhakti* (भक्ति) as a means of liberation has not been discussed there. In other words, philosophers have ignored *bhakti* (भक्ति) both as a *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ) and as a means of *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ). For this reason we have not discussed it either in the chapter of PTP and in the chapter of FVP.

But then also we cannot leave *bhakti* (भक्ति) undiscussed. There are some reasons. It is true that in our standard philosophical texts *bhakti* (भक्ति) has not been discussed anywhere as *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ) or as a means of *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ). It is also true that in the long debate between *samuccayavāda* (समुच्चयवाद) and *asamuccayavāda* (असमुच्चयवाद) importance is given to only *jñāna* (ज्ञान) and *karma* (कर्म). But this is also true that it has not been said

anywhere that *bhakti* (भक्ति) is not important. Other than these philosophical discussions Ādi Śaṅkarācārya has given great importance to *bhakti* (भक्ति). He has written many devotional hymns and poems. Sometime in the *Upaniṣadas* also *bhakti* (भक्ति) has been highly praised.<sup>19</sup> Even in recent time many educated (both in philosophy and in other areas) persons, who are against *karma* (कर्म), give importance to *bhakti* (भक्ति). They support *jñāna* (ज्ञान) or *bhakti* (भक्ति) (or both) but not *karma* (कर्म). The *Bhakti vāda* (भक्तिवाद) has a long tradition. They accept that *bhakti* (भक्ति) is a means [*puruṣārtha sādhana* (पुरुषार्थ साधन) or *sādhana bhakti* (साधनभक्ति)] of man's highest fulfilment. Our discussion of *puruṣārtha sādhana* (पुरुषार्थ साधन) cannot be completed if we do not discuss *bhakti* (भक्ति) and the place of it along with *jñāna* (ज्ञान) and *karma* (कर्म). So it is reasonable to discuss *bhakti* (भक्ति) in a separate chapter rather than not discussing it at all or discussing it only as a part of our discussion of philosophical theory of *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ) or as a part of familiar view of *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ).

We have mentioned earlier that on the subject of *puruṣārtha-sādhana* [means of attaining *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ साधन), here *mokṣa-sādhana* (मोक्ष-साधन)] neither the discussion about radical *asamuccayavāda* (असमुच्चयवाद) nor about *bhaktivāda* (भक्तिवाद) we have found in any classical works on philosophy. Even we can say that the references which they usually give on the basics of the *Gītā* are not also convincing. The radical *asamuccayavādīn-s* (असमुच्चयवादी) made reference to an earlier part of the *Gītā*'s verses 42 – 44 of the canto two. But in the last two verses <sup>20</sup> of the canto sixteen the *Gītā* has explicitly stated that there is the need for both

*karma* (कर्म) and the *Śāstra* (शास्त्र); and here *Śāstra* (शास्त्र) means the *Veda* (and *Dharma-Śāstra*) which enjoins *karma* (कर्म) (actions or as the modern people said rituals or ritualistic actions.). In his commentary on this two verses Śaṅkarācārya has written that in this passages the *Gītā* tells us that those who do not follow what [*karma* (कर्म)] *Śāstra* (शास्त्र) has taught us (to perform) and act independently, they cannot become eligible for attaining *siddhi* (सिद्धि) or *mokṣa* (मोक्ष).<sup>21</sup> So, it will not be reasonable to say that *Gītā* tells us to reject *karma* (कर्म) or *karma-mārga* (कर्ममार्ग) or to accept only *jñāna-mārga* (ज्ञान मार्ग). On this matter Sri Śaṅkarācārya only said that *karma* (कर्म) cannot be equally important or a direct means of *mokṣa* (मोक्ष). But he never said anywhere that *karma* (कर्म) has no role at all in achieving *mokṣa* (मोक्ष). In the writing of philosophers like Udayanācārya<sup>22</sup> or Gaṅgeśopādhyāy<sup>23</sup> also we do not find any mention of the radical *asamuccayavāda* (असमुच्चयवाद). Perhaps this view is of some modern thinkers which do not have much philosophical importance. They probably base their views on selective readings of some texts like the *Gītā* and they do not seem to be acquainted with the philosophical literature on this subject. Moreover they perhaps are acquainted with only some portions of the *Gītā* and not full of it. Even the great supporter of *bhakti vāda* (भक्तिवाद), Madhusūdana Saraswatī, has not ignored the importance of *karma* (कर्म) in his elucidation of the *Gītā*.<sup>24</sup> The great scholar Bhutnāth Saptatīrtha has translated and explained this work of Madhusūdhana. He has also translated and explained the whole of Jaimini's *Mīmāṃsā sūtra*.<sup>25</sup> Thus he knows very well the position of both the forms of *Mīmāṃsā* — *Pūrva Mīmāṃsā* and *Uttara Mīmāṃsā*. He said explicitly that not only *bhakti* (भक्ति) but *karma* (कर्म) is also

necessary in achieving the highest goal of life.<sup>26</sup> We will not discuss radical *asamuccayavāda* (असमुच्चयवाद) any more here. But one should carefully study the other passages where the *Gītā* speaks of renouncing *karma* (कर्म) and how Śaṅkarācārya, Madhusūdana and many others have interpreted these passages without categorically saying that *karma* (कर्म) has no place whatsoever or that *bhakti* (भक्ति) is the only or the ultimate means of *mokṣa* (मोक्ष).

Unlike the *jñānavādin-s* (ज्ञानवादी) all the *bhakti* (भक्ति) schools agree in believing that the absolute cannot be reached by knowledge. According to them, devotion (भक्ति) is essential and it is the most effective means to the realisation of God. Nalini Kānta Brahma is his book *Philosophy of Hindu Sādhanā*<sup>27</sup> said that there is a difference of opinion as to whether supreme devotion is by nature unmixed with knowledge (ज्ञान-शून्य), or is mixed with knowledge (ज्ञान-मिश्र). The highest stage of *bhakti* (भक्ति) is described in the *Bhāgavat Purāṇam* as *nirgūṇa bhakti* (निर्गुण भक्ति). Such supreme devotion can have, strictly speaking, no cause. Hence it is eternal. The *bhaktivādins* (भक्तिवादी) hold the view that Krishna-*prem* (devotion to the Lord) is eternal (नित्य-सिद्ध) and never comes into being (साध्य).

Like *Bhāgvat Purāṇam*, Sāndilya's *Bhakti sūtra* (भक्तिसुत्र) and Nārada's *Bhakti sūtra* (भक्तिसुत्र) are major sources of *Bhaktivāda* (भक्तिवाद). *Bhaktivādin-s* (भक्तिवादी) often offer to what Sāndilya and Nārada has said in their *Bhakti sūtra* (भक्तिसुत्र). Sāndilya defines *bhakti* (भक्ति) as supreme love to the Lord.<sup>28</sup> *Bhakti* (भक्ति) which is fully developed is known as *parā-anurakti* (परा-अनुरक्ति) or *parā bhakti* (पराभक्ति). The word 'parā' (परा) is very important here. Nārada also defines *bhakti* (भक्ति) as *parama-prem-rupa* (परम-प्रेम-

रूप). Here a point should be noted that the emphasis is put on the intensity of the process as well as on the object of devotion.

Generally speaking, two works as the source of bhakti-vāda are known to us. One is Nārada *sūtra* and the other is Śāndilya *sūtra*. Mm. Gopīnāth Kavirāj has said about a new *bhakti-sūtra*. In his book *Notes on Religion and Philosophy* Kavirāj-ji has said that the name of this book containing new *bhakti-sūtra* is *Bhakti-Mimāṃsā*. Though the name of the author of the book is not clear there, but it is clear that it belongs to a school of thought distinct from those Śāndilya and Nārada.<sup>29</sup> Here *bhakti* is described as a kind of *ulhāsa* (उल्लास) of the mind (1.1.2).<sup>30</sup>

*Bhaktivādin-s* (भक्तिवादी) claim that many great Advaita Vedāntins like Sri Śaṅkarācārya, Madhusūdana Svaraswatī etc. also realised the fact and so they shifted from *jñāna-mārga* (ज्ञानमार्ग) to *bhakti-mārga* (भक्तिमार्ग). Madhusūdana Svaraswatī, according to them, in his book *Bhaktirasāyaṇam* established *bhakti* (भक्ति) as a *parama puruṣārtha* (परम पुरुषार्थ). We will come back to this point soon.

Here a point needs to be noted. It is that *bhakti* (भक्ति) as a *parama puruṣārtha* (परम पुरुषार्थ) and *bhakti* (भक्ति) as a *mārga* (भक्तिमार्ग) are not one and the same thing. *Bhakti-mārga* (भक्तिमार्ग) is a way or path but *bhakti* (भक्ति) as *parama puruṣārtha* (परम पुरुषार्थ) is the highest goal. Hence, the first one is *sādhana* (साधन) and the last one is *sādhya* (साध्य). Sri Durgācarana Sāṅkhyā Vedāntatīrtha said in the introduction of the Bengali translation of the book *Bhaktirasāyanam* written by Sri Madhusūdana Svaraswatī that *bhakti* (भक्ति) is of two types. One is *sādhana bhakti* (साधन भक्ति)

and the other is *sādhya-bhakti* (साध्य भक्ति) or *parā bhakti* (परा भक्ति) or *prem bhakti* (प्रेम भक्ति).<sup>31</sup> Some may say here that this *sādhya-bhakti* (साध्य भक्ति) may be said as identical with *Bramha-vidyā* (ब्रम्ह विद्या) or *Brahma-sākṣātkār* (ब्रम्ह साक्षात्कार) which is nothing but a stage of *mokṣa* (मोक्ष) or liberation. But *bhaktivādin-s* (भक्तिवादी) will not support this view. According to them, the *sādhya-bhakti* (साध्यभक्ति) is not the same as *Brahma-sākṣātkār* (ब्रम्ह साक्षात्कार). For, Advaitin-s admit that in the stage of *Brahma-sākṣātkār* (ब्रम्ह साक्षात्कार) the distinction between men (जीव) and *Brahman* get destroyed or disappeared. But in the stage of *sādhya-bhakti* (साध्यभक्ति) the distinction between *bhakta* (भक्त) or *jiva* (जीव) and the God does not get destroyed, rather this distinction is very important and plays a vital role for *sādhya-bhakti* (साध्यभक्ति). Moreover, *Brahma-sākṣātkār* (ब्रम्ह साक्षात्कार) is the stage of indeterminate perception (निर्विकल्पक प्रत्यक्ष), whereas *sadhya-bhakti* (भक्ति) is a stage of determinate perception (सविकल्पक प्रत्यक्ष).

Now let us discuss *bhakti* (भक्ति) as means for achieving the highest goal of life. So far as the *Vaidika* (वैदिक) and *Nigama* (निगम) tradition is concerned, scholars refer to two sorts or kinds of literature where *bhakti* (भक्ति) has been given a prominent role. First we will briefly discuss the first kind of literature. This literature mainly contains the works on which Śaṅkarācārya's Vedānta is based (प्रस्थानत्रय) as well as Śaṅkarācārya's own commentaries on these works. These works are the *Upaniṣadas*, the *Gītā* and the *Brahmasūtra*. Many believe that in the *Veda*, as distinct from *Upaniṣada*, there is no awareness of the importance of *bhakti* (भक्ति).<sup>32</sup> This does not mean that such importance has been given in the *Upaniṣada*. In the *Upaniṣada* there are only occasional

reference to the importance of *bhakti* (भक्ति) towards *Guru* (गुरु) and *Devatā* (देवता). The commentaries of Śaṅkarācārya do not give much importance to *bhakti* (भक्ति).<sup>33</sup> However, some argue that one of the three sources from which Śaṅkarācārya derives his Advaita Vedānta *darśana* (दर्शन), namely, the *Gītā*, gives as much importance to the *bhakti* (भक्ति) as to *jñāna* (ज्ञान) (and also perhaps to *karma* (कर्म)). In the *Gītā*, *bhakti* (भक्ति) has been given a central position. The classical debate between *samuccayavāda* (समुच्चयवाद) and *asamuccayavāda* (असमुच्चयवाद) takes no note of this thing. Even Śaṅkarācārya in his commentary on the *Gītā* gives it no importance. Śaṅkarācārya has never said that according to the *Gītā*, *jñāna* (ज्ञान), *karma* (कर्म) and *bhakti* (भक्ति) are equally important. How then we come to believe that one third of the *Gītā* is devoted to *bhakti* (भक्ति) and its importance? It is a post-Śaṅkara view. Perhaps it originated only when Madhusūdana Saraswatī wrote his elucidation of the *Gītā* known as *Gūḍārthadīpikā*. Here he explained that in the first six chapters of the *Gītā*, *karma* (कर्म) and its importance has been discussed and in the last six chapters of it *jñāna* (ज्ञान) and its importance has been discussed. So, the first six chapters are separated from the last six chapters according to their subject. He also explained that to separate these two the *Gītā* discusses in the six chapters that fall in the middle portion of it and that is the theme of the yoga called *bhakti* (भक्ति). Madhusūdana Saraswatī has written all these in the beginning of the *Gūḍārthadīpikā*.<sup>34</sup> So, we can say that it was unknown to Śaṅkarācārya or even Udayanācārya and it is entirely Madhusūdana's original way of looking at the *Gītā*. But it may create problem to a student of Indian philosophy and he may ask how could Śaṅkarācārya miss the point that the *Gītā* gives equal

importance to *bhakti* (भक्ति)? Moreover, how could Madhusūdana find it there? We can give the answer following Madhusūdana's view. He reads and interprets the *Gītā* in the light of the *Bhāgavat Purāṇam* and not so much from the point of view of the *Upaniṣada* or the *Mahābhārata*.<sup>35</sup> In the *Bhāgavat Purāṇam* the three *yoga-s* — *jñāna-yoga* (ज्ञान योग), *karma-yoga* (कर्म योग) and *bhakti-yoga* (भक्ति योग) — are separately and clearly mentioned. In his *Bhaktirasāyanam*, Madhusūdana has quoted this passage of *Bhāgavat Purāṇam*.

Generally when we discuss about yoga, we mean Patanjali's *Yoga darśana*. He is famous for his teaching of the *aṣṭāṅga yoga* (अष्टाङ्ग योग). But when we speak of *karma-yoga* (कर्म योग), *jñāna-yoga* (ज्ञान योग) and *bhakti-yoga* (भक्ति योग) why the *aṣṭāṅga yoga* (अष्टाङ्ग योग) of Patanjali is not discussed? Madhusūdana in his *Bhaktirasāyanam* did not miss this point. He here exactly enumerated four *yoga-s* — the *karma-yoga* (कर्म योग), *aṣṭāṅga yoga* (अष्टाङ्ग योग), *jñāna-yoga* (ज्ञान योग), and *bhakti-yoga* (भक्ति योग). To reconcile his position with the explicit position of the *Bhāgavat Purāṇam* (which mentions only three *yoga-s*) Madhusūdana included *aṣṭāṅga yoga* (अष्टाङ्ग योग) into *jñāna-yoga* (ज्ञान योग).<sup>36</sup> He first says that there are four *yoga-s* which are good as means for man's attainment of goal of life (पुरुषार्थ). These four are *karma-yoga* (कर्म योग), *aṣṭāṅga yoga* (अष्टाङ्ग योग), *jñāna-yoga* (ज्ञान योग) and *bhakti-yoga* (भक्ति योग). Since he includes the second under the third there remains finally three; exactly the three which the *Bhāgavat Purāṇam* says.

As we stated above according to some *bhaktivādins*, even Śaṅkarācārya turned into a *bhakta* (भक्त) from *jñānī* (ज्ञानी) when he

realised the role of *bhakti* (भक्ति) to reach the state of *mokṣa* (मोक्ष).<sup>37</sup> Like Śaṃkarācārya, Madhusūdana Svaraswatī also, shifted from *jñāna-mārga* (ज्ञान मार्ग) to *bhakti--mārga* (भक्ति मार्ग). But, we can say that, there are no sufficient reasons to hold this view. *Bhaktivādin-s* (भक्तिवादी) may say that it seems to see *Soundrya Laharī* written by Śaṃkarācārya that he was also interested in the various actions (*karma-kānda*) of *Tantra*. Śibchandra Sārbabhōumo told in his book *Tantra Tattva* that in case of worshiping any God or Goddess in the field of *tantra* one must have a specific devotion technically known as 'bhāva' (भाव). This *bhāva* is nothing but *bhakti* (भक्ति) itself. To put it otherwise, worshiping God is not just a formal ritual but is supported by a deep emotion or *bhāva* (भाव). This *bhāva* (भाव) is the same as *bhakti* (भक्ति).

But from the above reasons one should not conclude in this way. Because according to Śaṃkarācārya *bhakti* (भक्ति) is nothing but a mature form of *jñāna* (ज्ञान) itself. *Tattvajñāna* (तत्त्वज्ञान) is the main cause [both for *jīvanmukti* (जीवन्मुक्ति) and *videhamukti* (विदेहमुक्ति)] for achieving *mokṣa* (मोक्ष). *Bhakti* (भक्ति) also helps but this *bhakti* (भक्ति) is a mature form of *jñāna* (ज्ञान) itself. For the stage of *jīvanmukti* (जीवन्मुक्ति), *bhakti* (भक्ति) or devotion to God plays a supporting role. Grace of God helps to achieve *tattvajñāna* (तत्त्वज्ञान). Another important point is that according to Madhusūdana, *bhakti* (भक्ति) is not the only means of *mokṣa* (मोक्ष). He also admits *jñāna* (ज्ञान) and *karma* (कर्म) as the means of *mokṣa* (मोक्ष). Many *bhaktivādīn-s* (भक्तिवादी), particularly Gaudīo *Vaiṣṇava-s*, hold the view that one can reach the highest fulfilment of life, i.e. *mokṣa* (मोक्ष) only through *bhakti* (भक्ति). However, Shāndilya<sup>38</sup> has said that he could not reach his fulfilment through the path of *jñāna*

(ज्ञान). But Madhusūdana holds that *dharma-karma* (धर्मकर्म) done in a detached way is the principal means of *mokṣa* (मोक्ष)<sup>39</sup>. He has also said that *bhakti* (भक्ति) follows *jñāna* (ज्ञान) and *karma* (कर्म) (उभयानुगत) in the sense that it is useful (उपकारक) for the two [*jñāna* (ज्ञान) and *karma* (कर्म)] and reinforces them. Since Madhusūdana has said that *jñāna* (ज्ञान) and *karma* (कर्म) are opposed to each other, he may be taken as *jñāna-karma-asamuccayavādin-s* (ज्ञान-कर्म-असमुच्चयवादि). In this respect he follows Śaṅkarācārya's position and hence Advaita Vedānta position. But it is also true that he speaks very highly of *bhakti* (भक्ति). But from this it should not mean that Madhusūdana had intention to minimize the Value of *jñāna* (ज्ञान). Though Madhusūdana writes that *bhakti* (भक्ति) or love of God is useful for all — *jñānī* (ज्ञानी) and *karmī* (कर्मी) — yet he gives the highest place to such *bhakti* (भक्ति) as is *jñāna* (ज्ञान) also.<sup>40</sup> According to him, only he can become the best *bhakta* (भक्त) who is *jñānī* (ज्ञानी). In the *Gītā* it has been said that the *bhakta* (भक्त), one who is devoted to God or loves him, can know him and can ultimately become one with him.<sup>41</sup> Here also *bhakti* (भक्ति) or love and devotion seem to be necessary for knowing. Similarly, Śaṅkarācārya also explains the word '*bhakti* (भक्ति)' as *bhakti* (भक्ति) of a knowledgeable person.<sup>42</sup>

Similarly, there are many more arguments for which it can be said that *bhaktivadīn's* (भक्तिवादी) conclusion is not right. Madhusūdana Svarasvatī wrote the book *Bhaktirasāyanam* before writing the commentary *Gūḍārthadīpikā* on the *Gītā*.<sup>43</sup> So, if the opponents demand that he shifted from *jñānamārga* (ज्ञानमार्ग) to *bhaktimārga* (भक्तिमार्ग) in his book *Bhaktirasāyanam* and established *bhakti* (भक्ति) then they should accept that after shifting

from *jñānamārga* (ज्ञानमार्ग) to *bhaktimārga* (भक्तिमार्ग) he wrote *Gūḍārthadīpikā*. Then they have to prove that Madhusūdana established *bhakti* (भक्ति) instead of *jñāna* (ज्ञान) in that work. But in this work he has not said anywhere that *bhakti* (भक्ति) is only necessary for achieving liberation and not *jñāna* (ज्ञान). Rather he has discussed on both *jñāna* (ज्ञान) and *bhakti* (भक्ति) where ever it is necessary to discuss. Mm. Phanībhūṣana Tarkavāgīś has rightly said in the Bengali translation of *Nyayadarśana* of Goutam that different types of *bhakti* (भक्ति) may reveal in different stages of *sādhana* (साधन). In the first two stages the difference between *bhakta* (भक्त) or devotee and God may be there, but in the third or last stage of worshipping God the difference between devotee and God get disappeared. Anyway, Madhusūdana has never said anywhere that *bhakti* (भक्ति) is the right means to liberation and not *jñāna* (ज्ञान). What he said is that without *bhakti* (भक्ति) *sannyās* (संन्यास), even *jñāna-mārga* (ज्ञानमार्ग) or knowledge as a way or path also is not able to help to achieve *mokṣa* (मोक्ष). He also said that the *Gītā* tells us about three *niṣṭhā-s* (निष्ठा) which are related as goal and as means to each other. These are *karma-niṣṭhā* (कर्म-निष्ठा), *jñāna-niṣṭhā* (ज्ञान-निष्ठा) and *bhakti-niṣṭhā* (भक्तिनिष्ठा). *Bhakti* (भक्ति) is the means of both *jñāna-niṣṭhā* (ज्ञान-निष्ठा) and *karma-niṣṭhā* (कर्म-निष्ठा). Knowledge of a person may not be successful to give liberation if the person is not a devotee in a true sense. So, *bhaktivādīn's* conclusion is not right.

Some held the view that the *bhaktivādīns* do not belong to the *Āgama* tradition, rather like the different schools of Indian philosophy, it belongs to the *Nigama* tradition. Because all schools of Indian philosophy are *Vaidika* systems. *Nigama* tradition means

what we call *Śruti* or the *Veda*. So, in this sense, all the conformist schools of Indian philosophical tradition will belong to the *Nigama* tradition. By *Āgama* tradition is meant the *Tantra* tradition. It has been said about *Nigama* tradition that *Nigama* means (*dharma*) *Karma-mārga* (कर्म-मार्ग) — the path of action. The *Āgama* or *tantra* has been said to be the “*Rāga mārga*”.<sup>44</sup> According to some scholars, this *Āgama* tradition admits all the three means to achieve *mokṣa* (मोक्ष) — i.e. *jñāna* (ज्ञान), *kārma* (कर्म) and *rāga* (राग). But here emphasis is on *rāga* (राग) or *upāsanā* (उपासना) including devotion and love.<sup>45</sup> It has been said “अमाये शिवमार्गेऽस्मिन् राग एव प्रशस्यते”,<sup>46</sup> which means in the path the devotees (of Śhiva) the *rāga* (राग) or love or devotion is the highly recommended<sup>47</sup> means of life’s fulfilment. It has also been said that in the *Kaliyuga* (कलियुग) the path recommended by *Āgama* is most suitable. This *Āgama* or *Tantra* is mainly divided into Śaiva, Vaiṣṇava, Śākta, Bauddha and Jaina.<sup>48</sup> There are many characteristic features of the *Āgamamārga* within which *Vaiṣṇavism* is included. These distinguish *Āgamamārga* from the *Nigama* or the *Vedamārga*. In the first place in the philosophies of the *Vedamārga* emphasis is on knowledge [*jñāna* (ज्ञान) or *prakāśa* (प्रकाश)] and not on action (क्रिया). In the philosophies of the *Āgamamārga*, *kriyā* (क्रिया) and *śakti* (शक्ति) are more or equally important. According to the *Āgama* tradition or *mārga*, the ultimate goal (चरम प्रयोजन) of life are two — *bhoga* (भोग) and *mokṣa* (मोक्ष).<sup>49</sup> By *bhoga* (भोग) it is meant prosperity (अभ्युदय) and by *mokṣa* (मोक्ष) (spiritual) liberation or emancipation. But all philosophical systems, all versions of PTP, fall in the *Vedamārga*. These PTPs contend that the ultimate goal is one and that is *mokṣa* (मोक्ष). All philosophical systems of the *Āgama-mārga* believe in the *reality* of the world and also that the world is full of

enjoyment.<sup>50</sup> What is important for our present purpose is that *Vaiṣṇava bhaktivāda* (वैष्णव भक्तिवाद) belongs to the *Tantra* tradition and not to the *Vaidika* tradition. *Bhaktivāda* (भक्तिवाद) is traced to Śāndilya and Nārada. It has been said that Śāndilya did his *sādhana* (साधना) in Brajamandal. With him began the tradition according to which *bhakti* (भक्ति) is the ultimate and the fifth *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ). Of this *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ), the means is also *bhakti* (भक्ति). So *bhakti* (भक्ति) is both a *puruṣārtha* (साध्यपुरुषार्थ) and its means (साधन पुरुषार्थ). So distinction is drawn between *sādhana-bhakti* (साधन-भक्ति) *bhakti* (भक्ति) as means and *sadhya-bhakti* (साधनभक्ति) or *bhakti* (भक्ति) as end in itself. These views that *bhakti* (भक्ति) is the fifth and the highest *puruṣārtha* (परमपुरुषार्थ) and that its means is not *jñāna* (ज्ञान) or *karma* (कर्म) but *bhakti* (भक्ति) are the views of some Vaiṣṇava-s. It is not necessarily the view expressed by the *Gītā* or accepted by Madhusūdana Saraswatī. Madhusūdana's interpretation of the *Gītā* verse 18/55 clearly shows this. The *Gītā* text in question explicitly says that *bhakti* (भक्ति) is the way to finding God and becoming one with Him. Madhusūdana there interprets *bhakti* (भक्ति) to mean *nididhyāsana* (निदिध्यासन). This *nididhyāsana* (निदिध्यासन) is clearly admitted in the *Nigamamārga* as a necessary step to liberation.<sup>51</sup> So far Madhusūdana's view does not seem to be the same as the view of the Vaiṣṇava Tantra.

Some may still hold the view that Madhusūdana transformed later. As an argument they say that when he wrote the elucidation on the *Gītā* he perhaps was not sure about the supreme role of *bhakti* (भक्ति) in reaching life's highest fulfilment. But his latest view we find in his *Bhaktirasāyanam*.<sup>52</sup> Though he admitted there that

*bhakti* (भक्ति) cannot go alone, yet it seems that in *Bhaktirasāyanam* he realised the value of *bhakti* (भक्ति). For, he there admitted *śuddha bhakti* (शुद्धभक्ति) or unmixed *bhakti* (भक्ति) in addition to *karma-misra-bhakti* (कर्म मिश्र भक्ति) or *bhakti* (भक्ति) involved in the practice of *karma* (कर्म) and *jñāna mishra bhakti* (ज्ञान मिश्र भक्ति) or *bhakti* (भक्ति) involved in the practice of pursuit of *jñāna* (ज्ञान).<sup>53</sup> It is an agreed truth that Madhusūdana was as great a bhakta (भक्त) as *jñāni* (ज्ञानी). But so far as the point of his latest work is concerned there are some views which do not seem to be correct. Some hold the view that *Bhaktirasāyanam* is Madhusūdana's latest book <sup>54</sup> and *Gūḍārthadīpikā* is his first or earlier work. But this view is not correct, for in his *Gūḍārthadīpikā* on the Gītā 18/66 Madhusūdana has written explicitly that certain things he had discussed in detail in his book *Bhaktirasāyanam*. Though it is also true that he held the view that in every stage of achieving the highest goal of life *bhakti* (भक्ति) is helpful. Incidentally, it may be mentioned that even in his *Bhaktirasāyanam* Madhusūdana gives due importance to *karma* (कर्म) or ritual performances and shows that it is according to *Śruti*. But Madhusūdanan never left the *Śruti* or *Nigama Mārga* (निगम मार्ग). He does not belong to the *Āgama mārga* or the tradition of Tantra. Similarly, some people think that he rejects *mokṣa* (मोक्ष) as *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ). But such view is not correct. He never said anywhere that *mokṣa* (मोक्ष) is not the right goal for man to pursue or it is not in fact a *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ). Also he never said anywhere that pursuit of *mokṣa* (मोक्ष) is a form of utter selfishness <sup>55</sup> and a man who is not above selfishness has not truly evolved. This charge of selfishness against the seekers of *mokṣa* (मोक्ष) is very popular. But theoretically and logically it is not tenable. We will continue this discussion but before that we have something more to

say regarding Madhusūdana and *bhaktivāda* (भक्तिवाद). Many *Bhaktivādin-s* (भक्तिवादी) do believe that *bhakti* (भक्ति) is the ultimate and fifth *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ) and that it is attainable through *sādhana bhakti* (साधनभक्ति). They think that Madhusūdana is the strongest supporter of this view. This also seems to be wrong. We have already considered Madhusūdana's position in his *Bhaktirasāyanam*. In his later book *Gūḍārthadīpikā* on the *Gītā* we find his more mature view. In this work he has spoken highly and extensively on the importance of *bhakti* (भक्ति). But in conclusion <sup>56</sup> he says that the final view of the *Gītā* is that *Bhagavat bhakti* (भगवत् भक्ति) or love and devotion to God is an aid to (साधनभूत) both of *karma* (कर्म) and *jñāna* (ज्ञान). Further he also said that this *Bhagavat bhakti* (भक्ति) is the result (फलाभूत) of both *karma* (कर्म) and *jñāna* (ज्ञान). It follows that he has not said that *bhakti* (भक्ति) is an independent means (साधन) of *puruṣārtha* (पुरुषार्थ). Even when it is *sādhyā* (साध्य) or *phala* (फल) its means is not *bhakti* (भक्ति) but *karma* (कर्म) and *jñāna* (ज्ञान). So, it is not reasonable at all to say that Madhusūdana ever held that *bhakti* (भक्ति) is the only ultimate *puruṣārtha* (परमपुरुषार्थ) and not *mokṣa* (मोक्ष) or that one can have this *bhakti* (साध्यभक्ति) only through *sādhana bhakti* (साधनभक्ति).

Many think that *mumukṣu-s* (मुमुक्षु) are selfish. But logically one can't say this. The main source on which selfishness is based is the belief in one's personal identity. Any man can only be selfish who have an ego sense. In the context of selfishness the self means ego (अहंकार). One who has this *ahaṅkāra* (अहंकार) can make difference between 'I', 'mine' on the one hand [*ahaṅ* (अहम्) & *mama* (मम)] and 'you', 'yours' on the other. Now, those who want to transcend this level of *ahaṅkāra* (अहंकार) or ego still may have ego-

sense. But these two are not the same. *Mumukṣu-s* (मुमुक्षु) are the people who really want to transcend this ego or selfishness.<sup>57</sup> *Mumukṣu* (मुमुक्षु) seeks to kill the ego in him for which he could be selfish. But they may still have ego in the sense that they are searching the true sense of soul or *ahaṁ* (अहम्). But since for them the difference between 'I' and 'You' are meaningless, they have no selfishness. This same goal *bhaktivādin-s* (भक्तिवादी) also mean but in a different way. In the *Nigama-mārga* (निगम-मार्ग) or the *Veda-mārga* (वेद-मार्ग), *mumukṣu* (मुमुक्षु) seeks to fully realize that he is not the ego.

According to *bhaktivādin-s* (भक्तिवादी), one can transcend ego-sense through the path of love to God or *bhakti* (भक्ति). Here love becomes universal. But still they have ego in the sense that they have universal ego. This universal ego kills small ego which is the main source of selfishness. Thus we can say that *mumukṣu* (मुमुक्षु) and *bhakta* (भक्त) — both want to transcend ego or selfishness but in a different way. One is saying that ego (small) sense is false and we need to replace it by the true knowledge of our own self and other is saying that (small) ego stands in our way of fulfilment and we should replace it by universal self which will bear love towards all.<sup>58</sup>

From years ago and still now many uneducated, simple minded and even educated Hindu people expressed sympathy and support to the *bhakti āndolan* (भक्ति आन्दोलन). The *bhaktivāda* (भक्तिवाद) associated with this *bhakti āndolan* (भक्ति आन्दोलन) is nearer to the Gouḍiya Vaiṣṇava-s. *Bhaktivāda* (भक्तिवाद) of these Vaiṣṇava-s is derived directly from the teachings of Shri Chaitanya

Mahāprabhu and Mahāprabhu's views seem to be primarily based on the *Bhāgavat Purāṇam* and *Brahma Samhitā*.

### Notes and References

<sup>1</sup> Generally speaking these modern Hindus hold that the final goal of life is self-improvement and self-realization which they think is more a spiritual goal rather than religious goal. Many of them are neither atheist nor theist. And they think spirituality is a third alternative between theism and atheism. The practice of spirituality does not require the performance of religious rituals nor does it require belief in personal God usually associated with idol worship etc. which are among the religious rites they abandon.

<sup>2</sup> It is, according to many of them, self-understanding and self realization [sort of *mokṣa* (मोक्ष)].

<sup>3</sup> It may be said that there is no such *darśana* (दर्शन) or Indian philosophy and we need not discuss the theme of *bhakti* (भक्ति) in a philosophical discussion. It is better to say that it is not among the standard systems of Indian philosophy. But here we follow Madhusūdana Saraswatī who used the expression “अस्माकं दर्शने” to mean *Bhakti darśana* (भक्ति दर्शन) — Svaraswatī, Madhusūdan, *Bhaktirasāyanam*, (translated in Bengali and explained by Sri Sāmkhya Vedāntaīrtha, Durgācharan) Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, Kolkata, 1404 (Bengali era), p. 20.

<sup>4</sup> Some may say that Madhusūdana Saraswatī's theory is based on the *Bhagvad Gītā* which is more like *Upaniṣada* or even *Smṛti* rather

than *Purāṇa*. We will discuss later that Madhusūdana viewed and interpreted the *Gītā* in the light of *Bhāgvat Purāṇam*.

<sup>5</sup> It has been so called in a work of Madhusūdana Saraswatī, *Bhaktirasāyaṇam* (translated in Bengali and explained by Sri Sāmkhya Vedāntatīrtha, Durgācharan), Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, Kolkata, 1404 (Bengali era).

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., p. 17.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>8</sup> *Dharma* (धर्म) that has been taught particularly in the *Bhāgavat Purāṇam*.

<sup>9</sup> Tripathi, Rammurti, *Āgam Ke Ālok Me Bhrātiya Kāvyaśāstra* (in Hindi), Pune Vidyapith, Pune, 2001.

<sup>10</sup> In the Tantra literature, particularly the literature of Kāshmir Śaivism, *Āgama* is invariably used in the sense in which we use the word Tantra. In this sense the tradition of Tantra is a parallel and different tradition than the Vaidika tradition. In the Tantra literature Śruti or Veda is called *Nigama*. — Tripathi, Rammurti, '*Āgam Ke Ālok Me Bhrātiya Kāvyaśāstra*' (in Hindi), Pune Vidyapith, Pune, 2001.

<sup>11</sup> These are the two of the three major forms of *nāstika darśana*-s. It is commonly believed that all three oppose the entire *Vaidika* tradition including the Hindu dharma and the *āstika* philosophies of India. But there is a difference. Cārvākas are opposed to *dharma* (धर्म) but Buddhism or Jainism is not so opposed. They are opposed to Cārvāka's anti-religion position. — Kavirāj, Gopīnāth, *Notes on*

*Religion and Philosophy*, Sampurnananda Sanskrit University, Varanasi, 1987, P. 83.

<sup>12</sup> Sen, Kṣitimohan, *Hindu Dharma*, (in Bengali), (edited by Amartya Sen), Ananda Publishers, Kolkata, 2008.

<sup>13</sup> *Bhāgavat Purāṇam* — 11/20/06.

<sup>14</sup> In Bankimchandra's *Ānandamath* and also Rabindranātha's writing we find the place and importance of *bhakti* (भक्ति). Many *Brāhmadharmavādins* (ब्राम्हधर्मवादी) like Keśab Chandra Sen practiced *bhakti* (भक्ति).

<sup>15</sup> In this form the Hindu dharma is often described as वेदान्त प्रतिपाद्य धर्म or वेदान्त धर्म or ब्राम्ह धर्म.

<sup>16</sup> The Brāhmas like Śivanāth Śāstrī were *Jñāna-vādins* in this sense.

<sup>17</sup> They may find supporting utterance in the *Rudrahṛdaya Upaniṣad*. There it has been said “ज्ञानेनैव हि संसारविनाशो नैव कर्मणा ...” II35II. But generally speaking the Upaniṣadas seem to hold that *jñāna* (ज्ञान) is the final and the most fundamental means of *mokṣa* (मोक्ष) or *samsāra nivṛtti* (संसार निवृत्ति).

<sup>18</sup> As we explained Samuccaya-vāda means the view that *jñāna* (ज्ञान) and *karma* (कर्म) together and equally directly act as means of *mokṣa* (मोक्ष). *Karma* (कर्म) is as important and direct means as the *jñāna* (ज्ञान). In its standard version Asamuccaya-vada contends that *karma* (कर्म) is only *an indirect and less important* means, it is not equally primary or principal means as *jñāna* (ज्ञान). According to the modern Vedantins or some radical modern Hindus, *karma* (कर्म) is not a means at all, not even an indirect or secondary means.

19 'यस्य देवे परा भक्तिर्यथा देवे तथा गुरौ' — 6/23 श्वेताश्वेतरोपोनिषद्.

20 यः शास्त्रविधिमुत्सूज्य वर्तते कामकारतः।

न स सिद्धिमवाप्नोति न सुखं न परां गतिम् ॥ — 16/23 *The Gītā*.

तस्माच्छास्त्रं प्रमाणं ते कार्याकार्यव्यवस्थितौ ।

जात्वा शास्त्रविधानोक्तं कर्म कर्तुमिहार्हसि ॥ — 16/24 *The Gītā*.

21 *The Gītā* — 16/23.

22 Udayanācārya, *Kiranāvalī*, translated by Śāstri, Gourīnāth, West Bengal State Book Board, Kolkata, 1990.

23 Gangeśopādhyāy, *Tattvacintāmaṇi*, the last section of Anumāna khanda, edited by Pt. Kāmākhyānāth Tarkavāgīśa, Choukhamba Sanskrit Pratisthan, Delhi, 1990.

24 Saraswatī, Madhusūdana, *Guḍārthadīpika*, commentary on Sreemadbhagavad Gītā (editd by Brahma, Nalinī Kānta with Bengali translation of Saptatīrtha, Bhūtanāth), Nababharat Publishers, Kolkata, 1986.

25 Saptatīrtha, Bhūtanāth (translated and edited), *Mīmāṃsādarśanam*, (in two volumes), Basumati Sahitya Mandir, kolkata.

26 *Ibid.*, Nivedan.

27 Brahma, Nalinī Kānta, *Philosophy of Hindu Sādhanā*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1993.

28 'सा परानुरक्तिरिश्वरे'— *Śāndilya sūtra*, as quoted in the introduction of *Bhaktirasāyanam*, translated in Bengali and explained by Sri Sāmkhya

Vedāntatīrtha, Durgācharan, Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, Kolkata, 1404 (Bengali era).

<sup>29</sup> Kavirāj, Gopināth, *Notes on Religion and Philosophy*, (edited by Śāstrī, Gaurīnāth), Sampurnananda Sanskrit University, Varanasi, 1987, p. 33.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., p. 33.

<sup>31</sup> Svaraswatī, Madhusūdan, *Bhaktirasāyanam*, translated in Bengali and explained by Sri Sāṃkhya Vedāntatīrtha, Durgācharan, Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, Kolkata, 1404 (Bengali era), p. 5.

<sup>32</sup> Yogendranāth Sāṃkhya Vedānta Tirtha, has decisively refuted this view in his book. — Bāgchi, Yogendranāth, *Veder Mantrabhāge Adhyātmavidyā*, (in Bengali) Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, kolkata, 1965.

<sup>33</sup> Some hold that it is not strictly true. First Śaṃkarācārya has written many hymns or stotras which are full of emotion of love and devotion to Gods and Goddesses. His *stotras* (स्तोत्र) of Annapūrṇā, Dūrgā, Gangā etc. are very popular. Many Vaiṣṇavas say that all these were written when in his later years Śaṃkarācārya became convinced that highest fulfillment of life cannot come through *jñāna* (ज्ञान) but only through *bhakti* (भक्ति). This however, seems unfounded.

<sup>34</sup> The opening verses 4-6 of the work.

<sup>35</sup> Though in the *Gītā māhātmyam* it has been said that the *Gītā* contains the essence of the teachings of the *Upanisadas*; as if it has been obtained from the *Upanisada* just as we get milk by milking a cow.

<sup>36</sup> Saraswatī, Madhusūdana, *Bhaktirasāyanam*, (translated in Bengali and explained by Sri Sāmkhya Vedāntatīrtha, Durgācharan), Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, Kolkata, 1404 (Bengali era), p. 2.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>38</sup> Śāndilya is the author of one of the three *Bhaktisūtras*. It is generally known that only two *Bhaktisūtras* are available. The second is by Nārada and is known as Nārada *Bhaktisūtra*. But recently a third *Bhaktisūtra* known as *Bhakti-Mīmāṃsā* has been discovered and published by Gopināth Kavirāj.

<sup>39</sup> निष्कामकर्मानुष्ठानम् मूलम् मोक्षोस्य कीर्तितम् — Verse no.41, Saraswatī, Madhusūdana, *Guḍārthadīpika*, commentary on Srimadbhagavad Gītā, Nababharat Publishers, Kolkata, 1986.

<sup>40</sup> 'तेषाम् ज्ञानी नित्ययुक्त एकभक्तिर्विषिष्यते' — Beginning verse 39, Saraswatī, Madhusūdana, *Guḍārthadīpika*, commentary on Srimadbhagavad Gītā, Nababharat Publishers, Kolkata, 1986.

<sup>41</sup> भक्त्या मामभिजानाति यावान्यश्चास्मि तत्त्वतः ।

ततो मां तत्त्वतो जात्वा विशते तदनन्तरम् — *Bhagavad Gītā* 18/55.

<sup>42</sup> 'तेषां ज्ञानी नित्ययुक्त एकभक्तिर्विशिष्यते ।

प्रियो हि ज्ञानिनोऽत्यर्थमहं स च मम प्रियोः' — *Bhagavad Gītā* 7/17.

<sup>43</sup> The *Gītā* 18/65 and 18/66.

<sup>44</sup> Tripāthī, Rāmamurti, *Āgam ke Ālok me Bhrātiya Kāvyaśāstra* (in Hindi), Pune Vidyapith, Pune, 2001, P. 4.

<sup>45</sup> *Bhakti* (भक्ति) is defined as "सा परानुरक्तिरिश्चरे" — *Śāndilya sūtra*.

<sup>46</sup> Tripāthī, Rāmamurti, *Āgam ke Ālok me Bhrātiya Kāvyaśāstra* (in Hindi), Pune Vidyapith, Pune, 2001, p. 5.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., p.13.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>51</sup> आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यो मन्त्यव्यो निदिध्यसित्यव्य — 2/4/5 — *Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣada*.

<sup>52</sup> Madhusūdana Saraswatī wrote in the *Gūḍārthadīpikā*, Beginning verses, verse no.19 that ignorance about self is removed when knowledge of the self is attained.

<sup>53</sup> Saraswatī, Madhusūdana, *Gūḍārthadīpikā*, Beginning verses, verse no.7, Nababharat Publishers, Kolkata, 1986.

<sup>54</sup> Introduction of *Bhaktirasāyanam* of Saraswatī, Madhusūdana, (translated in Bengali and explained by Sāṃkhya Vedāntatīrtha, Durgācarana), Sanskrita Pustak Bhandar, Kolkata, 1404 (Bengali era).

<sup>55</sup> 'प्रायेण देव मुनयः स्वविमुक्तिकामा मौनं चरन्ति विजने न पदार्थनिष्ठाः ॥

नैतान्विहाय कृपणान्विमुक्षु एको नान्यं तदस्य शरणं भ्रमतोऽनुपश्ये ॥ 7/9/44—  
*Srimad Bhāgavad Purāṇam*, Motilal Banarsi Dass, Delhi, 1988.

<sup>56</sup> At the end of his book, that is on the portion of the *Gītā* 18/66.

<sup>57</sup> Best expression of this is the *Nirvānadaśakam* of Śaṃkarācārya.

<sup>58</sup> Swami Vivekānanda believed in this matter that the teachings of the Vedānta are a great help. His doctrine of Practical Vedānta is an elaboration of this insight. But without being opposed to *bhakti* (भक्ति) Vivekānada was more in the line of *Jñāna-vāda* (ज्ञान-वाद) than the *bhakti-vāda* (भक्ति-वाद) of the *Bhakti āndolan* (भक्ति-आन्दोलन).

-----